

Exhibit 13

Comparing the Reply Comments of One Stop Financial, Group Discounts, 800 Discount and Winback & Conserve Program against the Reply Comments of CCI

Designation will be either
Exact Duplicate
OR
Slight Variation

CCI Reply Comments No.	Corresponding paragraph in One Stop Financial, et al. Reply	Comparison
1	33	Slight variation
2	36	Slight variation
3	37	Slight variation
4	38	Exact Duplicate
5	39	Exact Duplicate
6	40	Exact Duplicate
7	41	Exact Duplicate
8	42	Exact Duplicate
9	43	Exact Duplicate
10	47	Slight Variation
11	48	Exact Duplicate
12	57	Exact Duplicate
13	58	Exact Duplicate
14	59	Slight variation
15	60	Exact Duplicate
16	61	Exact Duplicate
17	62	Slight Variation
18	63	Exact Duplicate
19	64	Slight Variation
20	65	Exact Duplicate
21	66	Exact Duplicate
22	67	Slight Variation
23	68	Exact Duplicate
24	69	Slight Variation
25	70	Exact Duplicate
26	71	Exact Duplicate
27	72	Exact Duplicate
28	73	Exact Duplicate

CCI Reply Comments No.	Corresponding paragraph in One Stop Financial, et al. Reply	Comparison
29	74	Exact Duplicate
30	79	Exact Duplicate
31	80	Exact Duplicate
32	81	Exact Duplicate
33	82	Slight Variation
34	83	Exact Duplicate
35	84	Slight Variation
36	85	Exact Duplicate
37	86	Exact Duplicate
38	87	Slight Variation
39	88	Exact Duplicate
40	89	Exact Duplicate
41	96	Exact Duplicate
42	97	Exact Duplicate
43	98	Exact Duplicate
44	99	Slight Variation
45	100	Exact Duplicate
46	101	Exact Duplicate
47	102	Exact Duplicate
48	103	Exact Duplicate
49	104	Exact Duplicate
50	105	Exact Duplicate
51	106	Slight Variation
52	107	Slight Variation (bolding is the only difference)
53	108	Slight Variation
54	109	Exact Duplicate
55	110	Exact Duplicate
56	111	Exact Duplicate
57	112	Exact Duplicate
58	113	Exact Duplicate
59	114	Exact Duplicate
60	115	Exact Duplicate
61	116	Exact Duplicate
62	117	Exact Duplicate
63	118	Exact Duplicate

CCI Reply Comments No.	Corresponding paragraph in One Stop Financial, et al. Reply	Comparison
64	119	Exact Duplicate
65	120	Exact Duplicate
66	121	Exact Duplicate
67	122	Exact Duplicate
68	123	Exact Duplicate
69	124	Exact Duplicate
70	125	Exact Duplicate
71	126	Exact Duplicate
72	127	Exact Duplicate
73	128	Exact Duplicate
74	129	Exact Duplicate
75	130	Exact Duplicate
76	131	Exact Duplicate
77	132	Exact Duplicate
78	133	Exact Duplicate
79	134	Exact Duplicate
80	135	Exact Duplicate
81	136	Exact Duplicate
82	137	Exact Duplicate
83	138	Exact Duplicate
84	139	Exact Duplicate
85	140	Exact Duplicate
86	141	Slight Variation
87	142	Exact Duplicate
88	143	Exact Duplicate
89	144	Exact Duplicate
90	145	Exact Duplicate
91	146	Exact Duplicate
92	147	Exact Duplicate
93	148	Exact Duplicate
94	149	Exact Duplicate
95	150	Exact Duplicate
96	151	Exact Duplicate
97	152	Exact Duplicate
98	153	Exact Duplicate
99	154	Exact Duplicate

CCI Reply Comments No.	Corresponding paragraph in One Stop Financial, et al. Reply	Comparison
100	155	Exact Duplicate
101	156	Exact Duplicate
102	157	Exact Duplicate
103	158	Exact Duplicate
104	172	Exact Duplicate
105	173	Exact Duplicate
106	173 ¹	Exact Duplicate
107	174	Exact Duplicate
108	175	Exact Duplicate
109	176	Exact Duplicate
110	177	Exact Duplicate
111	178	Exact Duplicate
112	179	Exact Duplicate
113	210	Exact Duplicate
114	211	Exact Duplicate
115	212	Exact Duplicate
116	213	Exact Duplicate
117	214	Exact Duplicate
118	215	Exact Duplicate
119	216	Exact Duplicate
120	217	Slight Variation
121	218	Slight Variation
122	219	Slight Variation
123	220	Slight Variation
124	249	Slight Variation
125	250	Exact Duplicate
126	251	Exact Duplicate
127	252	Slight Variation
128	253	Exact Duplicate
129	254	Exact Duplicate
130	255	Exact Duplicate
131	256	Slight Variation
132	257	Exact Duplicate
133	258	Slight Variation

¹ There are two paragraphs with number 173 but the text is different.

CCI Reply Comments No.	Corresponding paragraph in One Stop Financial, et al. Reply	Comparison
134	259	Exact Duplicate
135	260	Exact Duplicate
136	261	Slight Variation
137	262	Slight Variation
138	263	Slight Variation
139	264	Exact Duplicate
140	265	Slight Variation
141	282	Exact Duplicate
142	283	Slight Variation
143	284	Slight Variation
144	285	Slight Variation
145	286	Slight Variation
146	287	Slight Variation
147	288	Slight Variation (bolding only difference)
148	289	Exact Duplicate
149	290	Slight Variation (bolding only difference)
150	291	Slight Variation
151	292	Slight Variation
152	293	Slight Variation
153	294	Slight Variation
154	295	Slight Variation
155	296	Slight Variation (bold and underline only difference)
156	297	Slight Variation
157	298	Exact Duplicate
158	299	Slight Variation
159	300	Slight Variation
160	301	Slight Variation
161	302	Exact Duplicate
162	303	Slight Variation
163	304	Exact Duplicate
164	305	Exact Duplicate
165	317	Exact Duplicate
166	318	Slight Variation

CCI Reply Comments No.	Corresponding paragraph in One Stop Financial, et al. Reply	Comparison
167	365	Exact Duplicate
168	366	Exact Duplicate
169	367	Exact Duplicate
170	368	Slight Variation
171	369	Exact Duplicate
172	370	Exact Duplicate
173	371	Exact Duplicate
174	372	Exact Duplicate
175	373	Exact Duplicate
176	374	Exact Duplicate
177	375	Exact Duplicate
178	376	Exact Duplicate
179	377	Exact Duplicate
180	378	Exact Duplicate
181	379	Exact Duplicate

Exhibit 14



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

April 27, 2005

Mr. Alfonse G. Inga
P.O. Box 1234
Little Falls NJ 07424

Dear Mr. Inga:

I am in receipt of your undated letter sent by e-mail on April 26, 2005.

As I know you are aware, your options for attempting to resolve your dispute with AT&T include pursuing further proceedings before the district court, or asking the Commission – through the filing of an appropriate pleading under Part 1 of the Commission's rules – to initiate an administrative proceeding.

There may be other options I have not thought of. It is not, however, the role of the Commission's Office of General Counsel to opine on potential legal arguments you ultimately may present to the Commission or to advise you where to go from here. I ask you once more to cease making such requests to our attorneys.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Austin C. Schlick".

Austin C. Schlick
Acting General Counsel

cc: David Carpenter

Exhibit 15

From: EzyStudentFunds [mailto:ezystudentfunds@optonline.net]

Sent: Monday, March 19, 2007 12:14 PM

To: Deena Shetler; UMHOLTZ, THOMAS, ATTOPS; Frank Arleo; lgsjr@usa.net; phillo@giantpackage.com; Joe Kearney

Subject: Deena: Status on discrimination issues...

Deena Shetler

Now that the IRS has issued a primary jurisdiction referral to resolve all shortfall issues that only leaves petitioners reconsideration request open regarding the discrimination issues.

AT&T and petitioners will be having a call with the new Judge Wigenton on Wed. that is taking over for retired Judge Bassler.

We are talking to Judge Wigenton regarding who my designated "contact at AT&T" will be, which has **nothing to do with the FCC issue**; a different case ID entirely.

AT&T on March 9th filed a brief with the District Court to supposedly just address the designated contact issue but decided that it would also provide Judge Wigenton with information on the case before the FCC.

The information AT&T provided was totally irrelevant to AT&T's attempt to modify a Court Order as to who I can contact at AT&T.

What AT&T has done in the filing to the District Court is an obvious attempt to "frame its position" on what is before the FCC to the new Judge.

AT&T obviously believed petitioners may have had to go back to the District Court to obtain additional primary jurisdiction referrals. At the time of AT&T's filing of March 9th 2007 to the District Court, it did not know that the IRS on March 14th 2007 would issue its primary jurisdiction referral order on the shortfall issues to the FCC.

If AT&T was simply going to the District Court to address who my company could contact at AT&T, why in the world would it need to select certain documents from the FCC case to send to Judge Wigenton as an exhibit?

AT&T stated to the District Court that I sent 37 emails over 7 months to Tom Umholtz but showed zero evidence of any of the emails. Why? AT&T real angle was simply to frame the FCC case for Judge Wigenton. If AT&T had shown Judge Wigenton the emails content the Judge would have been exposed to content that contains the overwhelming evidence against AT&T.

If AT&T was that interested in making sure Judge Wigenton was "up to speed" on the case why not just point her to the case file ID 95-908; there she can read a thousand pages!!!

Now that AT&T "in its attempt to frame the issue" has opened the Judge up to issues that are before the FCC, petitioners must counter AT&T's attempt to frame the FCC issues.

Petitioners will advise the Court that besides the traffic only transfer issue being before the FCC the shortfall issues has been referred to the FCC by the IRS.

This leaves within petitioners FCC Request for Reconsideration of the 1/12/07 FCC Order, just the discrimination issues that the FCC must decide whether or not it will adjudicate.

However, now that AT&T has opened up the FCC issues to the District Court, petitioners will not only address AT&T's attempt to modify the designated contact order, but will ask the District Court to issue a primary jurisdiction referral on the discrimination issues to the FCC; especially since it has already been briefed at the FCC and there are no disputed facts.

Petitioners will brief then speak to the Court on Wednesday call, about a primary jurisdiction referral order on discrimination.

Given the fact that there are no disputed facts and the discrimination issues are already briefed before the FCC, petitioners believe that Judge Wigenton would want all issues (traffic only transfer, shortfall issues, discrimination issues) resolved by the FCC prior to the District Court getting the case back.

On another note there are other USA States Taxation Departments that are now looking at joining the IRS in pursuit of State tax delinquencies and are also willing to issue primary jurisdiction referrals to the FCC on case 06-210 to resolve the shortfall telecom issues.

We wouldn't think the FCC needed more primary jurisdiction referrals on the same exact issue, in the same case, but if it makes a difference we will obtain them.

Thank you,
Al Inga Pres.
800 Discounts, Inc.
Copy:
AT&T Tom Umholtz
Frank Arleo esq.
Joe Kearney
Phil Okin
Larry Shipp

Exhibit 16

ARLEO & DONOHUE, L.L.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Frank P. Arleo
Timothy M. Donohue

Of Counsel:
Jo Ann K. Dobransky
Dawn M. Donohue

622 Eagle Rock Avenue
Penn Federal Building
West Orange, NJ 07052
Telephone: (973) 736-8660
Fax: (973) 736-1712

March 30, 2007

Via ECF and Overnight Mail

Honorable Susan D. Wigenton, U.S.M.J.
United States District Court
M.L. King, Jr. Federal Bldg. & Courthouse
Room 2037
50 Walnut Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Re: **Combined Companies, Inc., et al. v. AT&T**
Civil Action No. 93-5456

Dear Judge Wigenton:

A. Introduction

This law firm represents plaintiffs Winback & Conserve Program, Inc., One Stop Financial, Inc., Group Discounts, Inc. and 800 Discounts, Inc. ("the Inga Companies") in this matter. We are advised that Your Honor has been assigned this case as a result of Judge Bassler's recent retirement. We are writing to respond to defendant AT&T's recent letter in advance of the April 2, 2007 telephone conference.

In addition, we are writing to request that this Court also resolve a pending issue concerning the scope of Judge Bassler's primary jurisdiction referral to the FCC. AT&T has flip-flopped its position in a thinly veiled attempt to delay this matter at the FCC. Thus, this letter sets forth a critical issue that requires a

reconsideration and to advise the parties by Friday March 30, 2007 to give this Court guidance on the scope of the referral.

On March 14, 2007 the IRS itself issued a primary jurisdiction referral to the FCC asking the FCC to resolve all the shortfall telecom issues to determine whether shortfall charges were permissible or not, so as to establish a taxable base to pursue AT&T on hundreds of millions in tax evasion charges; and several states are now also investigating AT&T.

The FCC advised the parties within its 2003 decision and also on January 12, 2007 that if there were disputed facts the District Court is the place to go to resolve the disputed facts. Plaintiffs filed supplemental briefs at the FCC demanding that AT&T state what the actual disputed facts were, instead of simply stating that there were disputed facts. AT&T has simply continued to claim that there are disputed facts so the FCC won't rule, despite evidencing no disputed facts.

AT&T's newly minted "disputed facts" position is a thinly veiled attempt to have this matter languish in the FCC and hope there is no ruling. AT&T is in a catch-22. If the shortfall charges are permissible, AT&T owes many millions in taxes; if the charges are not permissible AT&T loses the telecom case. AT&T loses either way and, as a result, plaintiffs are being whip-sawed by AT&T's incredible new position that it does not want the shortfall issues decided at all. This Court has referred this case to the FCC for rulings on all issues. There was absolutely no